

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ORCA SECURITY LTD.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant	)	C.A. No. 23-758-JLH-SRF
	)	
v.	)	<b>REDACTED PUBLIC VERSION</b>
	)	
WIZ, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff.	)	

**MOTION FOR REDACTION OF MEMORANDUM ORDER**

Pursuant to the Court’s Memorandum Order (D.I. 169), Wiz, Inc. (“Wiz”) respectfully moves to redact 29 words of the Memorandum Order. Orca Security Ltd. (“Orca”) has stated that Orca takes no position on this motion.

Although there is a presumptive right of public access to judicial proceedings (*In re Avandia Mktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 924 F.3d 662, 672 (3d Cir. 2019)), that right is not absolute. *Id.* A party seeking to seal part of the judicial record bears the burden of showing “that the material is the kind of information that courts will protect and that disclosure will work a clearly defined and serious injury to the party seeking closure.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

Good cause must be demonstrated to justify redacting an order. *Mosaid Techs. Inc. v. LSI Corp.*, 878 F. Supp. 2d 503, 507 (D. Del. 2012). In determining whether good cause exists, “courts weigh the harm of disclosing information against the importance of disclosure to the public.” *Id.* at 508 (citing *Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 23 F.3d 772, 787 (3d Cir. 1994)). Courts have found good cause to redact “business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Littlejohn v. BIC Corp.*, 851 F.2d 673, 678 (3d Cir. 1988). “[I]f a case involves private

litigants, and concerns matters of little legitimate public interest, that should be a factor weighing in favor of granting or maintaining an order of confidentiality.” *Pansy*, 23 F.3d at 788.

Consistent with those standards, Wiz respectfully requests that the Court approve the limited redactions reflected in Exhibits A and B. Exhibit A contains as highlighted the information Wiz proposes to be redacted, and Exhibit B is the proposed redacted version that Wiz proposes to be filed on the docket. Wiz only seeks to redact 29 words in the Court’s 10-page Memorandum Order.

Wiz proposes that references to the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Declaration  
of Nir Dagan (“Dagan Decl.”), ¶ 2; D.I. 155-10 at ¶¶ 3, 16; see also D.I. 157 at 2-3. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Dagan Decl., ¶ 3; D.I. 155-10, ¶ 12. Wiz therefore requests that [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] be redacted from the Memorandum Order, as reflected  
in Exhibits A and B. *See* D.I. 157 at 2-3.

Additionally, Wiz’s proposed redactions are very narrowly tailored and consist of only references [REDACTED] Dagan Decl., ¶ 2.

Finally, the public has little legitimate interest in this particularly confidential Wiz information, but the potential harm to Wiz, if the information is disclosed, is severe. Dagan Decl., ¶¶ 2, 3. Wiz therefore has shown good cause for the limited redactions.

For the foregoing reasons, Wiz respectfully requests that the Court grant this motion and direct the Clerk of the Court to docket the redacted version of the Order attached hereto as Exhibit B.

Counsel for the parties met and conferred and Orca's counsel stated that it takes no position on this motion.

OF COUNSEL:

Jordan R. Jaffe  
Catherine Lacy  
Alex Miller  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &  
ROSATI, P.C.  
One Market Plaza  
Spear Tower, Suite 3300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 947-2000

Lisa D. Zang  
Callie Davidson  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &  
ROSATI P.C.  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, 28th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
(424) 466-6900

Praatika Prasad  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &  
ROSATI P.C.  
1301 Ave. of the Americas, 40th Fl.  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 453-2803

Dated: October 17, 2024

/s/ Christine D. Haynes

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)  
Kelly E. Farnan (#4395)  
Christine D. Haynes (#4697)  
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.  
One Rodney Square  
920 N. King Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 658-6541  
cottrell@rlf.com  
farnan@rlf.com  
haynes@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-  
Plaintiff Wiz, Inc*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 17, 2024, true and correct copies of the foregoing document were served, via e-mail, on the following:

**BY E-MAIL**

Jack B. Blumenfeld  
Rodger D. Smith  
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP  
1201 N. Market Street  
P. O. Box 1347  
Wilmington, DE 19801

**VIA EMAIL**

Douglas E. Lumish  
Lucas Lonergan  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
140 Scott Drive  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
  
Blake R. Davis  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Kristina D. McKenna  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
200 Clarendon Street  
Boston, MA 02116

/s/ Christine D. Haynes  
Christine D. Haynes (#4697)  
haynes@rlf.com